

Assistant Director of Planning and Economic Regeneration
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

12 Laurel Drive
Mill Farm Estate
Pagham
PO21 3ND



11th January 2017

Dear Sir

P/140/16/OUT Land South of Summer Lane, West of Pagham Road, Pagham

I vehemently object to the above application. In addition to the 700 dwellings already planned for Pagham the application for 400 houses in the centre of the village is a straw that will break the camel back! This development will drastically increase traffic, particularly at peak times, going through the village to Chichester on a road that will already be congested from other developments. An already struggling infrastructure would be exacerbated with increased road congestion of those commuting out of the village, there are definitely not enough local jobs and there is already a serious lack of parking in the village. The loss of agricultural land and loss of views for those along the Pagham Road combined with the potential impact on the Nature Reserve and Pagham Harbour cannot be ignored.

The developer's may promise land for a doctor's surgery, or community hub, allotments, school, scout hut etc. but who will pay for these to be built? It may be on a wish list for the village but it's no good if we don't have money and resources to build and sustain them. I suggest they will very likely not be built, where then is the social support for to access local services for health and cultural well-being for present and future generations?

The economic role of a development should be to contribute to building a strong economy. Arun has already recognised the high proportion of elderly living within the District and has identified it as a key challenge within the emerging Local Plan. The Plan recognises that the District has a below average proportion of working age residents. Conclusions drawn is that workers will commute in and out of Pagham, thereby creating more traffic on already congested roads. That does not contribute to a low carbon economy?

Losing any Grade of agricultural land surely is very irresponsible, we will never get it back. We need to be self-sufficient and not have to rely on imports in these uncertain times. We should be utilising and building on brownfield sites wherever possible and protect agricultural and greenfield land.

Flooding is a major issue for all proposed developments in Pagham, as is investment in the infrastructure, the roads, Dr's and schools are all nearing capacity. The run off from fields and roads is already a problem for the village and with the lack of effective maintenance of the Rife over the years, we have suffered flooding and will suffer much more flooding in the future. With no firm statement from Southern Water, can our sewage plant cope with a development of 400 houses in addition to the 750 proposed dwellings and the 130 houses already agreed for the village. The need to adapt to climate change surely is not helped by laying down concrete over ground which is already prone to flooding. No matter how many pipes, channels or attenuation ponds you may have the water eventually all runs to the sea, and if the Rife, which is also one of the main arteries for the Chichester Lavant Flood Alleviation Scheme, is compromised, the village will suffer. That is not protecting or enhancing our natural built and historic environment.

The Pagham Neighbourhood Plan should be considered a material consideration for any development. The policies contained in the Plan have been created to meet the development needs of the village following a full consultation with the residents and should be taken into account. The 130 houses originally proposed and agreed to should be enough! Any further large scale developments will not be sustainable developments for the village of Pagham.

I believe this development should not be considered in isolation in light of the recent consultations and planning applications submitted by two developers to build 750 additional houses in the village.

Developers have been let off the leash by the relaxed planning laws allowing greenfield developments and when the houses are sold, landowners and developers can walk away, money in their pocket, without any further thoughts for the viability or sustainability of where they have built. The world's population is growing at an ever increasing rate and the loss of acres of agricultural land is land we will never get back and will result in a loss of food production and employment, all of which will have a negative effect upon transport and energy use, a complete contradiction of the phrase 'sustainable development'.

I therefore **strongly** object to the proposed planning application for the reasons above.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of Jane Collins.

Jane Collins